

REMARKS

I. Introduction.

Claims 51-91 are pending and stand rejected. The Office Action states that the information disclosure statement filed on April 11, 2003 was not considered. The Office Action states that priority has not been granted since the Applicant has not filed certified copies of the priority applications. Claims 51-61, 63-68, 70-72, 74-79, 81-85, and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), or alternatively, under Section 103(a). Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 88-91 were separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a). Claims 51-91 were also provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

II. The Information Disclosure Statement.

The Information Disclosure Statement filed on April 11, 2003 is being re-submitted herewith. It is respectfully requested that the Information Disclosure Statement be considered.

III. Priority.

The Applicants submitted certified copies of the priority documents on January 30, 2004. It is respectfully requested that priority be granted.

IV. The 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)/103(a) Rejection.

Claims 51-61, 63, 70-72, 74-79, 81-85, and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), or alternatively, under Section 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,929,007 issued to Feng.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Feng reference discloses compositions having a surface tension that is greater than 24.5 nM/m. Among other things, the Feng reference does not teach or disclose, explicitly (or inherently) compositions having a surface tension less than 24.5 mN/m.

V. The 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) Rejections.

A. Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80.

Claims 62, 69, 73, and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng.

Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Feng reference discloses compositions having a surface tension that is greater than 24.5 nM/m. Among other things, the Feng reference does not teach or disclose, explicitly (or inherently) compositions having a surface tension less than 24.5 mN/m.

B. Claims 88-91.

Claims 88-91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng as applied to Claims 51-85 and 87, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,001,789 issued to Trinh, et al.

Claims 88-91 are not obvious in view of the Feng and Trinh, et al. references for the same reasons that the group of claims discussed previously are not obvious in view of the Feng reference. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

VI. The Double Patenting Rejection.

Claims 51-91 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of five other copending patent applications.

The Applicants are submitting a terminal disclaimer herewith.

VII. Summary.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER ROBERT FOLEY, ET AL.

By 
Jeffrey V. Bamber
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 31,148
(513) 627-4597

March 23, 2004

Customer No. 27752

CM-2492 Response 3-2004.doc